

REMARKS

The application includes claims 1-37 prior to entering this amendment.

Claims 1, 8, 11, 14, 20, 23, 26, and 29 are amended. The application remains with claims 1-8, 11-20, and 23-41 after entering this amendment. The applicants add no new matter and request reconsideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-13 and 36 were rejected as being anticipated by Ejiri. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, to recite “vertically scaling and horizontally scaling the original image using a vertical scalar and a horizontal scalar according to the plurality of corners, respectively.” Claims 8 and 11 include similar features. *See* Specification, page 6, lines 18-20.

Ejiri, as discussed in the amendment filed September 14, 2007, teaches distorting the projected image by mechanically adjusting the angle of the image plate. Ejiri does not teach or suggest scaling of the projected image, much less “vertically scaling and horizontally scaling the original image using a vertical scalar and a horizontal scalar according to the plurality of corners, respectively.”

The Office Action states that West teaches the vertical scaling. *See* OA, page 8, paragraph 2. West teaches a sample rate converter to enlarge or reduce the size of an image by a factor of L_x/M_x in the horizontal dimension and L_y/M_y in the vertical dimension, where L_x and L_y are integers and M_x and M_y are decimal numbers of arbitrary precision, to provide fine scaling control. *See* West, Abstract. That is, West teaches adjusting a size of an image horizontally or vertically according to some number of arbitrary precision, not “vertically scaling and horizontally scaling the original image using a vertical scalar and a horizontal scalar according to the plurality of corners, respectively.”

For at least these reasons, claims 1, 8, and 11, as well as their dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over Ejiri alone or in combination with West. Claims 1-13, 36, and 38-41 are therefore in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 26-28 and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ejiri in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Patent 6,056,408). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 26, as amended, recites “where the controller includes a vertical scalar and a horizontal scalar to scale the original image vertically and horizontally according to the plurality of corners, respectively.” *See* Specification, page 6, lines 18-20.

Ejiri does not teach or suggest scaling of the projected image, much less “vertically scaling and horizontally scaling the original image using a vertical scalar and a horizontal scalar according to the plurality of corners, respectively.”

Kobayashi does not cure the deficiency. Kobayashi teaches a method for displaying a projected image by projecting image light onto a projection plane, in which a positional deviation of the projected image from a predetermined position on the projection plane is detected by a detector and the positional deviation of the projected image is corrected according to a result of detection by the detector. *See* Kobayashi, Col.6, lines 15-46. Specifically, Kobayashi teaches detecting three elements of deviation or discrepancy between the projected image 5 and the screen 3, i.e., a positional deviation, a deviation in size, and an angle of torsion. The three deviation elements are then optically corrected by moving or deforming the three optical members included in the projection device 2 in accordance with the additional-optical-system control instruction 18. *See* Kobayashi, col. 5, lines 44-49; col. 6, lines 25-30, and lines 43-46. In other words, Kobayashi teaches moving or deforming the three optical members included in the projection device, not “vertically scaling and horizontally scaling the original image using a vertical scalar and a horizontal scalar according to the plurality of corners, respectively.”

West does not cure the deficiency. As discussed above, West teaches adjusting a size of an image horizontally or vertically according to some number of arbitrary precision, not “scale the original image vertically and horizontally according to the plurality of corners, respectively.”

For at least these reasons, claims 26 and its dependent claims 27-28, and 32-34 are patentably distinguishable over Ejiri in combination of Kobayashi. Claims 26-28 and 32-34 are therefore in condition for allowance.

Claims 14-19 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) were rejected as being unpatentable over Ejiri in view of Kobayashi and Deering. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 is amended to recite “means for vertically scaling and horizontally scaling the original image according to the plurality of corners.” As discussed above, Ejiri in combination of Kobayashi does not teach this feature. Deering does not cure the deficiency. Claim 14, along with associated dependent claims 15-19 and 37, are therefore in condition for allowance.

Claims 20-25 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ejiri in view of Kobayashi and West. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 20 and 23 are amended similarly as claim 1. As discussed above, Ejiri in combination of Kobayashi and West does not teach “vertically scaling and horizontally scaling the original image using a vertical scalar and a horizontal scalar according to the plurality of corners, respectively.” As such, claims 20 and 23-25 are patentably distinguishable over Ejiri in view of Kobayashi and West, and therefore in condition for allowance.

Claim 35 recites “graphically aligning a center of the image with a center of the projection surface using the graphical user interface; vertically scaling the original image responsive to the graphically selecting and aligning by calculating vertical scalar registers.” West does not teach this feature of claim 35.

West teaches adjusting a size of an image horizontally or vertically according to some number of arbitrary precision, not “scale the original image vertically and horizontally according to the plurality of corners, respectively.” Therefore, claim 35 is patentably distinguishable over Ejiri in view of Kobayashi and West, and in condition for allowance.

Claims 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ejiri in view of Kobayashi and Deering. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 29 is amended similarly as claim 1. For reasons discussed above, claims 29-31 are patentably distinguishable over Ejiri in view of Kobayashi and Deering, and in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The applicants request reconsideration and allowance of all remaining claims. The applicants encourage the examiner to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Julie L. Reed

Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 222-3613